

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/517,034

Filing Date: 12/07/2004

Applicants: Michael A. Zemlok et al.

Group Art Unit: 3724

Examiner: Stephen Choi

Title: Modular Power Tool

Attorney Docket: 0275J-000581/NPB

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMUNICATION

Sir:

The present issue fee was paid online yesterday. However, a notice was received that insufficient funds were available in the designated deposit account. Sufficient funds have since been deposited in the designated deposit account. Applicants are therefore resubmitting the issue fee payment request to insure timely payment. Consequently, if the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has already automatically debited the designated deposit account once sufficient funds were available, then the present duplicate payment request should be ignored.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to also charge
Deposit Account No. 02-2548 any additional surcharges under 37 C.F.R. 1.21(b)(1).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 14, 2008

By: 
Christopher M. Brock
Reg. No. 27313

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CMB:bh

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/517,034 Notice of Allowance Dated
12/14/2007

Filing Date: 12/07/2004

Applicants: Michael A. Zemlok et al.

Group Art Unit: 3724

Examiner: Stephen Choi

Title: Modular Power Tool

Attorney Docket: 0275J-000581/NPB

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

Applicants gratefully note the allowance of Claims 23-32, 44 and 45 in the present application. Reasons for Allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicants believe the record as a whole does make clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, Applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. While Applicants believe the claims are allowable, Applicants do not acquiesce that

patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the Reasons for Allowance do not separately address the subject matter of each claim, Applicants do not acquiesce to any inference that any one claim does not present patentable subject matter independent of any other claim.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2008

By: 
Christopher M. Brock
Reg. No. 27313

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CMB:bh